

REMARKS

1. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6-8, 12-13, 15, 17, 21-27, 31-32, 34, 36 and 38 as being anticipated by US Patent No. 6,236,977 to Verba et al. (“Verba”). For at least the following reasons, Assignee respectfully submits that Verba does not anticipate the claims as amended herein and request that this rejection be withdrawn.

In the Office Action, the Examiner acknowledged the Applicants’ prior argument that Verba does not teach redeploying an asset either publicly or privately in the event that the asset does not redeploy internally. However, the Examiner stated the claim language does not reflect a sequence to be followed in listing assets. Independent claims 1 and 21 have been amended herein to clarify an aspect of the invention. In particular, claims 1 and 21 now recite listing with the on-line internal trading community, then if the asset is not deployed, listing with the on-line private trading community or the on-line public market place. Thus the claims now require that an entity go through a sequence of first listing internally and then listing through an alternative marketplace/community. Claims 2-4, 6-8, 12-13, 15, and 17 depend from claim 1, whereas claims 22-27, 31-32, 34, 36 and 38 depend from claim 21. Accordingly, because Verba does not anticipate independent claims 1 and 21, it does not anticipate these dependent claims either. Assignee respectfully submits that the claims are now in condition for allowance and requests that the Examiner’s rejections be withdrawn.

2. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 9, 11, 16, 28, 30 and 35 as being unpatentable over Verba in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,715,402 to Popola. For at least the reasons set forth below, Assignee respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw these rejections.

As discussed above, Claims 1 and 21 have been amended. All other claims depend from one of these two independent claims. Assignee respectfully submits that because Verba does not teach or suggest all of the elements of claims 1 and 21, the combination of Verba and Popola does not teach or suggest the elements of claims 9, 11, 16, 28, 30, and 35 depending respectively therefrom and requests that these rejections be withdrawn.

The Examiner rejected claims 10 and 29 as being unpatentable over Verba in view of U.S. Patent 5,915,209 to Lawrence. For at least the reasons set forth below, Assignee respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw these rejections. As discussed above, Claims 1 and 21 have been amended. All other claims depend from one of these two independent claims. Assignee respectfully submits that because Verba does not teach or suggest all of the elements of claims 1 and 21, the combination of Verba and Lawrence does not teach or suggest the elements of claims 10 and 29 depending respectively therefrom and requests that these rejections be withdrawn.

The Examiner rejected claims 14, 18, 33 and 37 as being unpatentable over Verba in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,131,087 to Luke, et al. For at least the reasons set forth below, Assignee respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw these rejections. As discussed

above, Claims 1 and 21 have been amended. All other claims depend from one of these two independent claims. Assignee respectfully submits that because Verba does not teach or suggest all of the elements of claims 1 and 21, the combination of Verba and Luke does not teach or suggest the elements of claims 14, 18, 33, and 37 depending respectively therefrom and requests that these rejections be withdrawn.

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

On January 3, 2008, attorneys Brenda Holmes and Jim Sangston participated in a telephone interview with Examiner Abdul Basit. Claim 1 and the Verba reference were discussed. No agreement was reached.

CONCLUSION

The foregoing is submitted as a full and complete response to the non-final Office Action of October 9, 2007. Assignee respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes that there are any issues that can be resolved by a telephone conference, or that there are any informalities that can be corrected by an amendment, please call the undersigned at 404 685-6799. If any additional fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 11-0855.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brenda O. Holmes 40339/
Brenda O. Holmes
Reg. No. 40,339
Attorney for the Assignee

KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP
1100 Peachtree Street, Suite 2800
Atlanta, Georgia 30309
404.815.6530
Attorney Docket No.: L9090/269360